

SECRET

25X1A

MEMORANDUM FOR: DD/Pers-P&C

FROM :
Chief, Position Management & Compensation Division

SUBJECT : Exchange of Responses with the Inspector General on
the Office of Personnel Survey Report

REFERENCES : (a) Memo for DD/A fr IG dtd 22 Jun 76, subj: Office
of Personnel Survey Report
(b) Memo for IG fr D/Pers dtd 28 May 76, subj:
Response to the IG's Report of Survey of the Office
of Personnel
(c) Memo for DD/A fr IG dtd 30 Mar 76, subj: Office
of Personnel Survey Report

1. The review and assessment of the Inspector General's most recent response relative to the Office of Personnel Survey Report as contained in referent memo (a) reveals that serious and fundamental differences remain between the two Offices on the assignment of responsibility and authority for administering the position management and classification program in CIA. The issues are clearly drawn and can only be resolved by a clear statement of policy from the DCI promulgated in the Agency's regulations.

2. Re: para 2 - The Inspector General's assertion that the opposing views on such crucial issues as centralization vs decentralization and the appeal mechanism for settling unresolved disagreements are more semantic and procedural in nature rather than substantive, reflects not only a lack of perception as to the far reaching consequences of the Inspection Team's proposals on the stability, objectivity and integrity of a position management and classification program in CIA, but also misunderstanding of the intent and rationale of the Office of Personnel's counter proposal on these issues. Specifically, the Inspector General fails to realize that his recommendation for delegating authority to the Deputy Directors for authenticating Staffing Compelements represents a major step towards a decentralized position management and classification program by divesting the Director of Personnel of classification authority. This authentication authority would be exercised by the Deputy Directors with no assurances that classification decisions would be made in the interest of maintaining job/pay equity within and across Directorates.

SECRET

25X1

~~SECRET~~

It is reasonable to assume that Deputy Directors would have a tendency towards protecting their parochial interests, and thus would adjudicate position grade determinations on the basis of people-oriented considerations (i.e., provide headroom for promotion of deserving employees, increase employee productivity and morale and facilitate recruitment and retention of personnel), rather than on the basis of job content. Thus the Director of Personnel, in his role of monitoring Directorate adherence to the principle of job/pay equity would be placed in the untenable position of attempting to correct erroneous job classifications without real authority to do so except through appeal to the DDCI for final decision. This system, as proposed by the IG, would tend to erect greater barriers to understanding and would accentuate the adversary aspects of the position classification process in the Agency.

3. Re: para 3 - The Inspector General contends that the major difference in the appeals mechanism between the OP and IG proposals is procedural rather than substantive. This is debatable, since it is not clear in the conclusions and recommendations embodied in the IG's report on this matter as to whether the Director of Personnel would institute an appeal after or before classification decisions made by Deputy Directors are implemented. The former approach would certainly constitute a significant departure not only from existing policy of obtaining concurrence of operating components before Staffing Complement changes are implemented, but also from the current OP proposal for appealing unresolved differences between the Director of Personnel and a Deputy Director to the DDCI for final decision prior to authentication and implementation of those portions of the Staffing Complements involved. We agree with the IG that if his approach is adopted, the Director of Personnel would be placed in the untenable position of "challenging decisions already made." Furthermore, the Director of Personnel's responsibility for monitoring Directorate adherence to the principle of job/pay equity would become unduly burdensome, if not ~~x~~ unworkable, as experience has proven that it is more difficult to redress errors in position structure and grade levels than it is to adjudicate disagreements with the operating officials concerned before classification action is taken.

4. Re: para 4 & 5 - We agree with the Inspector General that an appeal mechanism does exist in the Agency, and that it is rarely used because of the absence of clear policy set forth in Agency regulations. We should strongly advocate the adoption by the DCI of a formalized statement of definitions and authorities relative to all facets of a centralized position management and classification program. The Inspector General should be advised that if the views of the Office of Personnel prevail in this regard that component managers and Deputy Directors would no longer have the option of deferring the resolution of issues, nor of resorting to questionable assignment practices to achieve their ends. The Staffing Complement would become a meaningful management document, as it would truly reflect on a timely basis classification

~~SECRET~~

decisions that were made in the interest of job/pay equity by PMCD, the Director of Personnel after discussions with the Deputy Director concerned, or the DDCI as the final appeal authority.

5. Re: para 7 - Although the Inspector General has withdrawn active opposition, he remains convinced that PMCD should limit its judgments and recommendations on organization and management of a surveyed component to those instances where such recommendations are dominant in the evaluation of position grades. We take strong objection to this view point for the following reasons:

a. Organization and management data obtained during the course of a position survey contributes significantly in the evaluation of individual positions reviewed during such survey. This data not only reveals job inter-relationships thus insuring a greater degree of job/pay equity, but also discloses the extent to which organizational structure, lines of authority, homogeneous or heterogeneous grouping of functions, supervisory-worker and professional-clerical position ratios, etc. influence position grade determinations. Thus it is clear that the position management process in its broadest context is inseparable from the job classification function.

b. As stated in the initial Office of Personnel response to the Office of Personnel Survey Report, a majority of managers of surveyed components found organization and management "feedback" information to be useful in managing their resources in an efficient and cost-effective manner.

c. At present PMCD represents the only focus for promoting effective manpower utilization and position management in the Agency. The Inspector General's persuasion towards limiting the scope of PMCD's position surveys to job analysis and evaluation functions would result in the Agency having no element responsible for carrying out management analysis and advisory services on a centralized and systematic basis. The Inspector General's attitude in this regard is perplexing as it is contrary to the President's concern that position management and classification systems are not functioning as effectively as they should in many Federal agencies as evidenced by numerous inaccurate job classifications, excessive organization fragmentations, duplication of work and superfluous layers of supervision which in the aggregate result in unnecessary increases in the cost of Government. As a consequence, all Federal agencies are required by a recently issued Presidential Order to reexamine their position management and classification systems in accordance with guidelines prescribed by the CSC and OMB and to correct and strengthen aspects of these systems which are found to be deficient. In contrast, the IG advocates a counter trend in CIA which, if known, would be unacceptable to the President and to the Congress. Therefore, PMCD suggests that all pertinent material on this subject, such as Presidential Directives, FPM Bulletins, minutes of IAG meetings and the Comptroller General's Report to the Congress, 4 December 1975, be brought to the attention of

~~SECRET~~

SECRET

the Inspector General so that he may reflect upon the deficiencies inherent in his proposal.

6. Re: para 8 - We concur in the IG's opinion that the proposed two-year tour of Officers in PMCD from each of the Directorates and the DCI Group would be too short to permit such officers to acquire job classification knowledges and skills to the degree normally expected of thoroughly trained position management officers. We view the proposed two year tour as a minimum requirement.

7. Re: Para 8 - We have no objection to limiting enrollment in the IG's proposed training course on CIA Personnel Administration and Management to Office-level managers and deputies. We feel strongly, however, that in addition to this course an Agency position management and classification course be established to educate management at all levels in the objectives and responsibilities of this essential element of personnel management. The lowering of personnel costs and adherence to the principle of job/pay equity should be significant concerns at all levels of management.

25X1A



SECRET

STAT

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000300020028-1

Approved For Release 2002/06/14 : CIA-RDP82-00357R000300020028-1